

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,633	03/16/2004	Robert G. Moores JR.	0275D-214COC	2966
27572 7590 08/03/2006 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			EXAMINER	
			KALAFUT, STEPHEN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745	
			DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/801,633	MOORES ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Stephen J. Kalafut	1745			
The Period for Re	ne MAILING DATE of this communication ap aply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
WHICHE - Extensions after SIX (- If NO perio - Failure to r Any reply r	TENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLOYER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [In a continue to the provisions of 37 CFR 1 is a mount of this communication. The specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period is a period for reply will, by stature to the second of the second of the second of the mail is the second of the	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			·			
1)⊠ Res	sponsive to communication(s) filed on 10.	July 2006.				
2a)⊠ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
	ce this application is in condition for allows	•	• •			
Clos	sed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.L	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition (of Claims					
4a) 5)☐ Cla 6)⊠ Cla 7)☐ Cla	im(s) <u>59-84</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withdration im(s) is/are allowed. im(s) <u>59-84</u> is/are rejected. im(s) is/are objected to. im(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application	Papers					
10)∭ The App Rep	specification is objected to by the Examin drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac slicant may not request that any objection to the placement drawing sheet(s) including the correport oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Certified copies of the priority documer Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have beer au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage			
2) Notice of I	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) In Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Art Unit: 1745

Claims 59-63, 65-73 and 75-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulz *et al.* (US 5,480,734) in view of Bunyea (US 4,871,629) and Mita (US 5,456,994), for reasons of record.

Claims 64 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulz et al. in view of Bunyea and Mita as applied to claims 59 and 70 above, and further in view of Miller (US 5,343,368), for reasons of record.

Claims 59-69 and 78-80 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,186. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of reasons of record.

Claims 78-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There is no antecedent for "the mechanism for coupling" in claim 78, line 3. The phrase "a removable battery pack" now appears in both lines 2 and 3 of claim 78. Are these the same pack? If so, the second instance of the phrase should include "the" instead of "a", while the "mechanism for coupling" should be preceded by "a". Claims 79 and 80 depend from claim 78, and would likewise be indefinite.

Applicant's arguments filed 10 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Schulz *et al.* illustrates heat dissipation while a battery is being charged, and not while it is being used, i.e., discharged. Schulz *et al.* also teach that towards the end of discharge, a battery's temperature will rise, thus showing a motivation for cooling the battery while it is in use.

Applicants correctly note that Bunyea does not disclose any heat dissipating mechanism.

Bunyea is cited for teaching a coupling mechanism between a battery pack and a cordless tool.

Applicants argue that Mita "relates to an automotive application" and thus provides no suggestion to combine its teachings with a handheld tool. This is not persuasive because combining the teachings of the references does not require combining their specific structures, *in re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973). Because Schulz *et al.*, as stated above, provide a reason to dissipate heat from a battery pack, and Mita show a means for doing so, it is submitted that the teachings of these references are mutually relevant.

In view of applicant's amendments, the previous rejections under 35 USC §102 and §112, 2nd paragraph are withdrawn. However, the rejection under obviousness-type double patenting remains, because neither arguments addressing this rejection nor a Terminal Disclaimer have been filed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Kalafut whose telephone number is 571-272-1286.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/801,633

Art Unit: 1745

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 5

sjk

W/MA

STEPHEN WALAFUL RIMARY EXAMINED GROUP 700